



Applying adaptive leadership to successful change initiatives in academia

Linda M. Randall

University of Baltimore, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, and

Lori A. Coakley

Bryant University, Smithfield, Rhode Island, USA

Applying
adaptive
leadership

325

Received April 2006

Revised November 2006

Accepted December 2006

Abstract

Purpose – To propose Heifetz's adaptive leadership model as the primary process for initiating change in today's more business-oriented academic environment in which colleges and universities are required to compete to attract students and are facing greater scrutiny and accountability from outside constituencies.

Design/methodology/approach – Two case studies are presented that underscore some of the challenges facing today's academic institutions. Heifetz's adaptive leadership model is applied to each case.

Findings – Leadership is more than an individual acting in a position. It is a process in which change initiatives must emanate from key stakeholders, all of whom are engaged in that process. The two cases presented in the paper serve to illustrate the greater potential for successful change initiatives offered by the adaptive leadership model.

Research limitations/implications – The research examines two specific case studies in which adaptive leadership dimensions are used to examine the success or failure of a change initiative. The study needs to be expanded to other situations to more fully explore the merits of this model. Other case studies are being examined.

Practical implications – The leadership model applied in this study can be used in any organization, academic or non-academic, which is confronting change initiatives that require both immediate action and commitment from myriad stakeholders.

Originality/value – To date, no other studies have employed adaptive leadership as a process to address the demands of the more business-oriented, academic environment.

Keywords Leadership, Higher education, Change management

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

In today's changing academic environment, leaders at higher education institutions are confronted with increasing demands to transform these institutions, as stakeholders' expectations have risen and resources have diminished. Colleges and Universities compete intensely to attract students and to generate revenues as operating costs rise and government subsidies decline. Higher education institutions are facing greater scrutiny and accountability from outside agencies that impact accreditation, funding, and financial aid resources (Boyett, 1996; Newman *et al.*, 2004; Raelin, 1995).

One outcome of the changing academic environment is the need to challenge models of leadership that focus on the competencies, behaviors, and situational contingencies of individual university leaders. Whereas, such models may focus on collegiality as the



Leadership & Organization
Development Journal
Vol. 28 No. 4, 2007
pp. 325-335

© Emerald Group Publishing Limited
0143-7739

DOI 10.1108/01437730710752201

primary aptitude for engaging faculty, and are concerned with satisfying departmental needs over those of the overall university, leadership in today's academia should take into account the needs and demands of various stakeholders. In the current environment faculty needs become one factor among many major elements that need to be considered to accomplish the mission and goals of the university.

The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that the changes needed for the institution to flourish in today's environment have greater potential for success if decision-makers view leadership as a "process" that requires innovation and input from all relevant stakeholders. Referred to as "adaptive leadership", Heifetz (1994) proposes a method of leading that can be sustained for the long-term, adopted by impacted stakeholders, and is responsive to the competitive higher education market. Heifetz *et al.* (2004, p. 24) stressed that leadership is the "activity of mobilizing people to tackle the toughest problems and do the adaptive work necessary to achieve progress". Specifically, this model provides a framework for determining when to and how to lead that can result in creative problem solving and foster successful and sustainable modifications in the relationship between the organization and its stakeholders (Glover *et al.*, 2002).

To illustrate the merits and potential of adaptive leadership in initiating or accomplishing successful change in academia two cases studies are analyzed. The first case examines the collapse of a small, private college. The adaptive leadership model is used to explain, in part, why the change initiatives implemented by the president failed to impact favorably on the crises the college was facing. In the second case, the chair of an academic department employs the adaptive leadership process to facilitate successful transformation of a major academic program.

Before presenting the case studies, we briefly explore other models of leadership that have been used to analyze the context of higher education. While such discussions held merit, and drew similar conclusions concerning the difficulties of leading in the university environment, they did not provide a clear course of action that reflected the demands of today's changing environment and that could be effectively applied to the case studies presented. We then summarize the dimensions of Heifetz's adaptive leadership model (Heifetz and Laurie, 1997). An analysis of the cases and discussion of the merits of applying adaptive leadership to the changing academic climate conclude the paper.

Leadership models

Leadership in today's academia must take into account the needs and demands of various stakeholders, and include these major stakeholders in the change process. It is no longer acceptable for any one stakeholder group to place responsibility for instituting change on the shoulders of one individual leader (Gregory, 1996; Rowley and Sherman, 2003).

Researchers who have studied leadership in today's more business-like university environment, where the university must be able to manage equally competing needs from the current marketplace, have focused on transactional leadership, transformational leadership, or a combination of both. Transactional leadership, which is based on motivating people to perform in exchange for specific rewards, has been shown to enable the university to manage the conflicting demands of maintaining a balanced budget while continuing to support the needs of the faculty (Pounder, 2001).

However, the limitation of this approach to leadership is evident: when leadership lacks the resources to provide a basis for the exchange, it can become difficult to obtain commitment from the faculty.

The ability of a leader to generate commitment to change underscores the primary dimensions of transformational leadership (Ramsden, 1998). Originally defined by Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1994), transformational leadership is the ability to motivate employees to excel beyond what is expected through the use of individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, and charisma. The practice of transformational leadership by the department Chair, has been found to be related to faculty satisfaction and the willingness to expend the extra effort required in the change process (Neumann and Neumann, 1999). Furthermore, this style of leadership works well in situations where administrators, have few resources with which to induce behavioral change (Rowley and Sherman, 2003).

Pounder (2001) examined the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and university organizational effectiveness. He concluded that the style of leadership which reflects a combination of both transformational and transactional dimensions may be most effective in providing the university with the flexibility it needs to make substantive changes.

However, the ever-present limitation of both the transactional and transformational leadership styles is its focus on the traits and behaviors of the individual leaders as the pathway to effect change. Therefore, if the transformational leader enters the change process too late, as with the interim president in the first case presented, there may not be sufficient time to gain enough support to initiate the necessary changes. Furthermore, when the transformational leader steps down, the leader's change initiatives may not be maintained unless subsequent leaders possess not only the same charisma and ability to inspirationally motivate, but the same vision.

Adaptive leadership

Adaptive leadership is based on the premise that leadership is more of a process rather than individual personal capabilities (Heifetz *et al.*, 2004). This process requires people to focus on the specific problems at hand and to modify the way they have worked in the past. According to Heifetz *et al.* (2004), this type of leadership should compel all stakeholders involved to work towards a solution through debate and creative thinking, identifying the rewards, opportunities, and challenges they will face. The outcome of the process should be positive change that is non-threatening to those responsible for generating and executing the change.

In addition, since adaptive leadership focuses on process, not person, this model employs the knowledge of all who have a vested interest in moving the organization to a higher level, and provides a framework for attaining employee commitment to actively participate in seeking and implementing solutions to challenges. By engaging people to become active participants in the change process, adaptive leadership offers a route around historical constraints that reinforce the way change has been traditionally introduced.

According to Heifetz and Linsky (2002), leaders are confronted by two types of problems – technical and adaptive. Technical problems are well defined, the solutions are known, and anyone with adequate expertise and organizational resources can solve them. Adaptive problems refer to problems that are not well defined, therefore the

solutions are not known in advance. When adaptive problems exist, there are generally many different stakeholders involved; each with his/her own interpretation of the issues at hand. Most importantly, solutions stem from the stakeholders themselves, not from one single entity, since “the problem is rooted in their attitudes, priorities, or behavior” (Heifetz *et al.*, 2004, p. 25). If the leader fails to recognize that the organization is being confronted by adaptive problems, and applies instead a more technical solution, successful change will be compromised.

The process of adaptive leadership involves six stages when executing change in a complex, organizational setting where non-routine decisions are required. These include identifying the adaptive challenge as previously discussed, focusing attention on the problem to make stakeholders aware that change must occur, framing the issues in such a way as to sustain their attention, maintaining stress at a productive level to ensure continued efforts toward change, securing ownership of both the problem and solution from the stakeholders themselves, and creating a safe environment for them by providing the resources and the “right cover” so no retribution will occur (Heifetz and Laurie, 1997) (Table I).

The following two situations faced by an interim president and academic department chairperson are presented to further underscore the possible benefits of applying the adaptive leadership process when implementing change in an academic environment.

Step one	Identify the type of problem	Technical: every day issues with common solutions; adaptive: challenging, new, uncommon situations
Step two	Focus attention	Get people to pay attention to key issues. Secure commitments from those who will help you sell the initiative. Engage those who have yet to climb on board with the change issue. Adopt the behavior you expect from others, and take responsibility for problems facing the organization
Step three	Frame the issues	Determine the time when issues must be presented to stakeholders, and focus on the opportunities such problems can provide. Employ the “discovery process” -step back and see the big picture
Step four	Secure ownership	Sustain the conditions through which stakeholders take responsibility for problem solving. Place the work where it belongs. Challenge employees’ expectations
Step five	Manage stakeholder conflict and maintain stress	Stakeholders with different agendas need to be aligned to achieve a higher purpose, while confronting conflict resulting from stakeholders’ personal issues. This may be accomplished establishing “rules of engagement” for discussing heated issues, and defining reporting structures
Step six	Create a safe haven	Furthermore, it is often necessary to uphold the productive stress required for change to occur; especially as adaptive problems often require time to resolve. Counterproductive measures need to be minimized by slowing pace of change when possible and by creating a secure place to discuss disparate perspectives

Table I.
Dimensions of adaptive leadership

Source: Heifetz *et al.* (2004)

Case I: Crisis management at a four-year college

Because the adaptive leadership model is not dependent on the abilities of an individual leader, the process can be instigated at any stage of a particular situation. In this first case, a fiscal crisis resulted from the move of an urban four-year college to a more suburban location, which was done with the expectation that a larger, more bucolic campus would serve as an enticement for increased enrollments. When student numbers did not increase, this tuition-dependent institution began to incur significant debt. Eventually, the Board of Directors replaced the President and reorganized the Board.

The new President was faced with myriad fires burning at once. In response, he approached the problems in a very systematic, top-down fashion, dictating the change process in relative isolation, seeking input solely from the Vice President. He faced draconian decisions concerning personnel and financial operations, and implemented hour-by-hour actions to keep the college fiscally viable. Though the institution was in crises, and the measures required were numerous, the new President chose to focus his efforts and attentions on developing a long-term strategic plan, including few of the relevant stakeholders in the process. With efforts focused on long-term solutions, the Board of Directors grew increasingly concerned that there would not be enough students or money to open the following fall semester. Faced with the increasing concern and pressure from faculty, students and families, the Board came to a crossroads with the president, and he, too, was let go.

The vice president was then chosen as interim president, as he had already earned the trust of the Board, faculty and staff through his efforts on the College's behalf in his previous role at the institution. The interim president asked the faculty, including himself, to accept a pay cut. Although the faculty agreed, they did so apparently from a sense of self-preservation. When the interim president subsequently asked for faculty assistance with student recruitment, he was faced with disappointing results. The faculty, marginalized in the initial change efforts, was less than willing to make phone calls or be more proactive in the recruitment process. In this situation, the faculty felt that the fiscal difficulties of the college were the responsibility of the interim president and the Board of Directors, regardless of the fact that all parties would be affected if the college failed. Thus, despite his best efforts in saving the institution, by summer the bank decided to no longer financially support the institution, and began the foreclosure process on the school.

"Leadership" in review

According to Heifetz, the first stage necessary when initiating institutional change is to determine if the problem facing the organization is technical or adaptive in nature. In the case above, the president believed he understood the issues confronting the college, and in effect identified them as technical. As such, he proceeded to address these problems in a very hierarchical, top down fashion, prescribing the actions that would be undertaken. For example, the recovery activities, while not conducted behind closed doors, were far from inclusive. In contrast, a leader employing a more adaptive style of crises management might have not only defined this problem differently, but would have communicated with all of the stakeholders, including the students, staff, faculty, Board of Directors, and the financial community. The involvement of the college community would have allowed the interim president, then, to get the key stakeholders

to secure ownership in finding a solution to the crisis, gaining institutional loyalty and buy-in, which could have helped to turn the crisis into an opportunity for the entire college community.

The implementation of the adaptive leadership process may not have reversed the eventual demise of the college but it would have provided the opportunity for bringing together the key stakeholders, utilizing the knowledge and resources of these people to work towards resolving the crisis.

Case II: Rebuilding a graduate program

In the second case, a master's level graduate program at an east coast university had experienced a 20 percent decline in enrollments over the past five years, with no indication of future abatement in the rate of decline. A new chair was hired and charged by the dean to determine whether the program should continue.

This graduate program had existed for over 25 years, and at one time was nationally ranked as one of the top 15 programs. This program offered courses in four locations and had evening and weekend formats. Also, there were 310 student files in the department, none of which indicated whether the student was actively pursuing the degree, which meant that the staff typically scheduled classes and hoped that students would enroll. Given the declining enrollments, the class cancellation rates were increasing, leading to student complaints. The department and division records could not give an accurate count of active students nor could they guarantee error-free communication with those students who were active. Another challenge faced by this chair was that the program relied heavily on part-time, practitioner faculty, which meant that the department was dependent upon a group of people whose commitment to the university and the program was on a course-by-course basis.

The new chair recognized that the first major issue was to get an understanding of the cause(s) of the enrollment problem. The chair communicated to staff, full-time and part-time faculty and students that she was willing to meet and to hear their concerns. The discovery of the cause of program's decline in enrollment was complex and needed input from many sources. In this attempt to uncover the reasons for the program's decline, it became evident that missing from the puzzle were the part-time faculty who had formerly been affiliated with the program, some for ten years, and students who had completed the vast majority of their credits but were no longer taking courses or corresponding with their advisors. Each of these groups had essentially "dropped out" of the program.

The chair discovered that the challenges confronting this program were not new and that there had been other attempts at improvement, which resulted in short-term blips in enrollment although the overall decline continued. During the three months of interviewing various stakeholders, it became evident that the challenge of rebuilding the program would be more than reviewing the curriculum. It would also mean creating a culture of change in regards to the behaviors and attitude of department staff and faculty as well as bringing people who had never been a powerful voice in the department to a "seat at the table".

The challenge was to change the core behaviors and culture of the department. From the interviews it was learned that each group blamed the other for the problems with the program. The faculty blamed the staff and the falling admission standards. The students believed that the faculty and staff were not responsive to their needs and

the staff believed that the faculty and students were overly demanding and did not understand the time and resource constraints the department faced. The most difficult challenge was to shift the constituents' focus from blaming each other to taking leadership in the change of the program.

Applying the adaptive leadership process

The chair took a number of steps that helped to create a change in the department that would be sustainable and long term. These changes addressed many underlying problems, including the need to modify the behaviors of faculty. For example, one pressing issue was the lack of pertinence of many of the courses that were being taught. The efforts by the chair resulted in the development by faculty of more up-to-date courses that reflected newly defined learning outcomes and responded to students' and the external communities' needs. Below is an analysis of the chair's approach, which reflects the six steps of Heifetz's adaptive leadership process.

Identifying adaptive challenges. The first process in Heifetz's adaptive leadership model is for the decision makers to determine if the problems facing the institution are technical, every day issues, or more adaptive in nature, unusual and complex. If the leader fails to recognize that the department is being confronted by adaptive problems, and applies instead a more mundane solution, successful change will be compromised.

The chair in this case recognized that declining enrollments were occurring not just because of exogenous events, such as a recession, but that there were internal problems that impeded improving enrollments and needed immediate attention. This stemmed from the myriad conversations the chair had with key stakeholders, including those who had already left the program. The chair developed a rule that only when she heard the same concern or reason for a problem three separate times from three seemingly unrelated sources, would it then be noted as a critical issue. From these meetings with the various constituents, it was evident the program's challenges were complex and adaptive in nature, and therefore the solution required an integration of input from all impacted stakeholders.

Focusing attention and framing the issue. Although there was a general consensus that there was a problem with the program, none of the faculty believed that they were the ones who needed to change it. More importantly, no one realized that if the problem with enrollment was not addressed, the program itself would be eliminated. This sense of complacency, along with a pattern of blaming others, would make leading the group through a profound change highly problematic. The chair therefore recognized that in order for the curriculum to be significantly changed, she would need the faculty to focus their attention on the critical issues facing the program, and claim ownership of the program's redesign.

Securing ownership of both the problem and solution from the stakeholders. The first step was to create an environment that would enable the faculty to discover the causes of the enrollment issues and identify potential solutions. A committee was formed whose charge was to review the various change options for the program. Stakeholders were chosen from all-important constituencies to serve on this committee. The faculty was split between the two disciplines of the department, and faculty subgroups were also represented. Committee notes were posted on a community online bulletin board to ensure that suggestions and concerns were heard from all of the subgroups on the committee. As ownership of the problem was secured, the committee developed a set of

recommendations that stressed the need to completely redesign the program, which would mean eliminating nearly 60 percent of the existing courses and updating the remaining forty percent. Typically, a proposal that recommended such drastic changes would have been met with tremendous resistance by the faculty. However, since the chair employed a more adaptive process by identifying and including all key stakeholders in determining the changes required, these stakeholders became the advocates for such radical change.

Managing conflict and regulating distress. In order to maintain a productive level of stress that will ensure the follow-through of change initiatives, the adaptive leader must ensure that the problems that have been identified and the solutions that had been proposed remain in the forefront. In the graduate program case, the chair provided many forums and online discussion boards for students and faculty to hear about the problems and to discuss the ramifications. Also, at these meetings and private one-on-one meetings, the chair began to discuss the possibility of having to reduce the number of course offerings and the potential of closing the program. At the end of each meeting, the chair commented that she wanted to create a program that would be a return to the previous quality and reputation, otherwise the program would be closed.

The chair created a program review committee, which became the outlet for productive debates. This review committee took over the process of discovering the extent of the problems. The committee's final report was a critical way to solicit the various opinions regarding the change.

Creating a safe haven. An important component of the successful redesign of the graduate program was the chair's efforts to create an atmosphere of trust among her, the faculty and the students. As the chair talked with many of the stakeholders in the program, it was increasingly difficult not to become fully enmeshed in the intradepartmental conflict. Faculty, students and administrators wanted the chair to choose who was at fault for the demise of the program. The process of staying above the political fray meant that the stakeholders could trust that the chair would listen to their concerns and provide a safe environment for them to disagree and not face any political retribution. Additionally, the chair made a concerted effort to publicly praise and appreciate people who made suggestions, no matter how critical they appeared to be of the change effort, and to deliver on resources and provide political "cover" for those who started to make suggestions for change. Also, as part of creating trust, she was careful to never promise anything that she could not deliver and to describe the situation as it truly was and to openly admit if she did not know the answer.

Epilogue

In the end, the total curriculum content of the program was developed. The faculty took charge of deciding which courses would be eliminated. New courses were developed based on an agreed upon set of student learning outcomes. Faculty were organized into subgroups and were responsible for the development of new courses and the redesign of existing courses that they had decided would remain in the new program. Students were excited about the new program and a transfer mechanism was established allowing existing students to take some of the new offerings and not impede their progress through the program. The program continues to improve and enrollment trends have reversed. A summary of the findings of the case is noted in Table II.

			Case 1	Case 2
Step one	Identify the type of problem	Technical: every day issues with common solutions; adaptive: challenging, new, uncommon situations	President applied an unsuccessful technical leadership approach to an adaptive situation	Dean recognizes problem as adaptive, leading to successful change initiative
Step two	Focus attention	Get people to pay attention to key issues. Secure commitments from those who will help you sell the initiative. Engage those who have yet to climb on board with the change issue. Adopt the behavior you expect from others, and take responsibility for problems facing the organization	Activity was focused on immediate institutional survival. Adequate support among all of the stakeholders who were best positioned to address the prevailing challenges was not obtained	Chair galvanizes faculty including practitioner faculty to underscore the criticality of the situation
Step three	Frame the issues	Determine the time when issues must be presented to stakeholders, and focus on the opportunities such problems can provide. This is aided by employing the "discovery process" -stepping back and seeing the big picture	Vice President communicated to parents and faculty the critical situation, and need for assistance. It was, however, too late in the process	Chair employs the "discovery process" – steps back and examines the big picture - to identify critical issues
Step four	Secure ownership	Sustain the conditions through which stakeholders take responsibility for problem solving and better adapted to the politics, culture, and history of their situation. Place the work where it belongs. Challenge employees' expectations	The major weakness in the leadership actions of the president was his failure to secure ownership of the problem from the faculty, or to include them in defining their own solutions to the impending crisis at the college	The chair, with the help from others on the curriculum committee, was able to get faculty to take ownership of the problem and more importantly to implement the recommended action steps

(continued)

Table II.
Dimensions of adaptive
leadership – summary of
the case studies

			Case 1	Case 2
Step five	Manage stakeholder conflict and maintain stress	Stakeholders with different agendas need to be aligned to achieve a higher purpose, while confronting conflict resulting from stakeholders' personal issue Uphold the productive stress required for change to occur	Interim president takes a pay cut himself, works with the union to secure faculty pay cuts, and works with the media and students to address rumors	The chair provided many forums and online discussion boards for students, and faculty to hear about the problems and to discuss the ramifications
Step six	Create a safe haven	Counterproductive measures need to be minimized by slowing pace of change and creating a secure place to discuss disparate perspectives	A safe haven was not created to ensure loyalty and support from the followers, especially faculty, who were anxious about the required changes	An important component of the successful redesign of the graduate program was the chair's efforts to create an atmosphere of trust

Table II.

Source: Heifetz *et al.* (2004)

Conclusion

It has been suggested throughout this paper that it is necessary to challenge models of leadership that focus on the competencies, behaviors, and the situational contingencies of individual leaders. Instead, the needs and demands of various stakeholders must be considered in order to accomplish the mission and goals of the academic organization. Case I demonstrated what happens when more top down approaches are applied to manage the crisis facing the institution. Case II illustrated the successful change initiative resulting in the resurrection of a current graduate program. By applying Heifetz's model of adaptive leadership (Heifetz, 1994) the failure of the college in the first case, and success of the chair in the second case, may both be better understood.

The adaptive leadership process, as examined in this paper, is not intended to be the only strategy available to solve significant organizational problems. However, this process can provide a set of guidelines that will enable leaders to know when and how to address the increased demand to be accountable, competitive, and financially viable in today's academic environment, while fostering sustainable and successful modifications in the relationship between the organization and its stakeholders.

References

Bass, B.M. (1985), *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, Free Press, New York, NY.
Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1994), *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
Boyett, I. (1996), "New leader, new culture, old university", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 17 No. 5, p. 24.

-
- Glover, J., Friedman, H. and Jones, G. (2002), "Adaptive Leadership: when change is not enough (Part one)", *Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 20 No. 2, p. 15.
- Gregory, M. (1996), "Developing effective college leadership for the management of educational change", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 17 No. 4, p. 46.
- Heifetz, R.A. (1994), *Leadership without Easy Answers*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Heifetz, R.A., Kania, J.V. and Kramer, M.R. (2004), "Leading boldly", *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 20-32.
- Heifetz, R.A. and Laurie, D. (1997), "The work of leadership", *Harvard Business Review*, January-February, pp. 124-34.
- Heifetz, R.A. and Linsky, M. (2002), "A survival guide for leaders", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 80 No. 6, pp. 65-73.
- Neumann, T. and Neumann, E.F. (1999), "The president and the college bottom line: the role of strategic leadership styles", *The International Journal of Education Management*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 147-56.
- Newman, F., Couturier, L. and Scurry, J. (2004), *The Future of Higher Education: Rhetoric, Reality, and the Risks of the Market*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Pounder, J.S. (2001), "New leadership and university organizational effectiveness: exploring the relationship", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 22 No. 6, pp. 281-90.
- Raelin, J. (1995), "How to manage your local professor", *Academy of Management Journal*, pp. 207-12.
- Ramsden, P. (1998), *Learning to Lead in Higher Education*, Routledge, New York, NY.
- Rowley, D.J. and Sherman, H. (2003), "The special challenges of academic leadership", *Management Decision*, Vol. 41 No. 10, pp. 1058-63.

About the authors

Linda M. Randall is Associate Provost at University of Baltimore. Major responsibilities include working with all academic schools and colleges on program development, providing leadership on special projects. While at Johns Hopkins University, Dr Randall was Chair of the Department of Management, Director of the Organization Development Human Resources Program and Associate Professor of International Management. Her research interests focus on Leadership in Higher Education and cross-cultural management issues. Dr Randall received her PhD in management from University of Massachusetts-Amherst, MBA from Harvard Graduate School of Business and BA in economics and political science at Swarthmore College.

Lori A. Coakley is an Associate Professor and Chair of the Management Department at Bryant University, outside of Providence, Rhode Island. Her research interests focus on Women in Management, Leadership in Higher Education, and International Leadership issues. Dr Coakley received her PhD in Organizational Studies from the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, MBA from the University of Lowell, and BA in American Studies from the University of California – Santa Cruz. Lori A. Coakley is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: lcoakley@bryant.edu

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.